

App. No.: 10/711338
Filed: September 12, 2004
Conf. No.: 5337

Page 3 of 3

REMARKS

The indicated allowability of claim 7, subject to its being rewritten in independent form is noted with appreciation. This claim has not been so rewritten at this time due to the amendment of certain of those claims upon which it depends.


Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 3, and thus forms claim 3 in independent form. Therefore it is believed to be only discuss, as to this claim, the rejection originally made against it.

Claim 3, which is a relatively simple and concise claim has been rejected on a combination of three references, that applicant respectfully believes do not teach the combination proposed. Furthermore it is submitted that even if the combination of these references was within the scope of those skilled in the art, the resulting combination would not result in the claimed structure.

Prior claim 3, now claim 1, calls for the cylinder that forms a cylinder bore to have two transversely extending projections that are received pivotally in bearing portions carried by the associated watercraft. The Examiner contends that Blanchard has projections 91 that are pivotally received in bearing openings 43. This may be true, but these projections 91 are defined by the reference as eye structures and they are not received in the side brackets, but rather appear to journal pins that are in turn journaled in the brackets. Thus as submitted above the combination fails to be met by the Examiner's combination.

Equally as important, applicant's structure is simpler and more robust than the Blanchard structure alone or in combination. Therefore, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time

Attachment: Credit Card Authorization